

and positive self-concept development, the Beautillion philosophy helps to prepare young men so that they can prosper as contributing members of society. In order to be selected as a "beau," these young men must have at least a "C" average and excel in one of four areas: academics, the arts, community service, and sports. Of course, most of the young men honored excel in more than one area.

The tireless dedication and devotion of my friend, Donna Rice, ensures that wonderful events that transform young people's lives happen each and every year. For that, I thank her. As a fellow Fisk University graduate, and member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., Ms. Rice has a long list of other achievements, honors, and awards. None are more valuable, however, than the experience and honor we both share of mentoring young black boys and teenagers. We share the same concern for the plight of young African American boys, and from this concern, Ms. Rice began her community leadership and scholarship project. Her once meager project has now been duplicated in 53 other cities throughout the United States and the Bahamas.

Tonight, as ten young men are honored as the leaders of tomorrow, let us also honor a leader of today—Ms. Donna LaVerne Daniels Rice, devoted wife to Dr. William Rice and the mother of three adult children. I thank my friend for her devotion to saving our young black boys.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know I had been granted medical leave to recover from hip replacement surgery for the legislative weeks of March 28 and April 4. While I was unable to place recorded votes on legislation considered by the House, I would like to state what my votes would have been.

On Tuesday, March 29, the House considered H.R. 839, the HAMP Termination Act of 2011, introduced by Representative MCHENRY of North Carolina. On rollcall vote No. 194, H. Amdt. 199 offered by Representative HANNA of New York, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 195, H. Amdt. 204 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 196, H. Amdt. 206 offered by Representative MALONEY of New York, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 197, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative LARSEN of Washington, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 198, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Wednesday, March 30, the House considered H. Res. 186, introduced by Representative BISHOP of Utah, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 471) to reauthorize the DC opportunity scholarship program, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote No. 199, on ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 200, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 201, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on March 30, the House considered H.R. 471, the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, introduced by Speaker BOEHNER. On rollcall vote No. 202, H. Amdt. 209 offered by Delegate NORTON of the District of Columbia, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 203, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative CUMMINGS of Maryland, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 204, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Thursday, March 31, the House considered H. Res. 189, introduced by Representative WEBSTER of Florida, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 658) to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote 205, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

Also on March 31, the House considered H.R. 872, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2011, introduced by Representative GIBBS (OH), under a suspension of the Rules. On rollcall vote 206, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, I would have voted "yes."

Further on March 31, the House began consideration of H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011, introduced by Representative MICA of Florida. On rollcall vote 207, H. Amdt. 210 offered by Representative MICA of Florida, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 208, H. Amdt. 216 offered by Representative GARRETT of New Jersey, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 209, H. Amdt. 217 offered by Representative DEFazio of Oregon, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 210, H. Amdt. 218 offered by Representative HIRONO of Hawaii, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 211, H. Amdt. 225 offered by Representative CAPUANO of Massachusetts, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 212, H. Amdt. 226 offered by Representative GINGREY of Georgia, I would have voted "yes."

On Friday, April 1, the House considered H. Res. 194, offered by Representative WOODALL of Georgia, Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1255) to prevent a shutdown of the government of the United States, and for other purposes. On rollcall vote 213, On Consideration of the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

Also, the House continued consideration of H.R. 658. On rollcall vote No. 214, H. Amdt. 235 offered by Representative PEARCE of New Mexico, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 215, H. Amdt. 236 offered by Representative SCHIFF of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 216, H. Amdt. 228 offered by Representative SESSIONS of Texas, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 217, H. Amdt. 229 offered by Representative LATOURETTE of Ohio, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 218, H. Amdt. 232 offered by Representative SHUSTER of Pennsylvania, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 219, the Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative SANCHEZ of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 220, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

The House then resumed consideration of H. Res. 194. On rollcall vote No. 221, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 222, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

The House then considered H.R. 1255, the Government Shutdown Prevention Act of 2011, introduced by Representative STEVE WOMACK of Arkansas. On rollcall vote No. 223, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions, offered by Representative WALZ of Minnesota, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 224, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Monday, April 4, the House considered H.R. 1246, to reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction, introduced by Representative ALLEN WEST, under a Suspension of the Rules. On rollcall vote 225, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, I would have voted "yes."

On Tuesday, April 5, the House considered H. Res. 200, introduced by Representative WOODALL (GA), providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 37) disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices. On rollcall vote No. 226, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 227, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 228, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

On Wednesday, April 6, the House voted on a Motion to Adjourn by Representative JACKSON of Illinois. On this rollcall vote No. 229, I would have voted "no."

The House then considered H. Res. 203, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 910) to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change, and for other purposes, introduced by Representative SESSIONS of Texas. On rollcall vote No. 230, On Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 231, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 232, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on Wednesday, the House began consideration of H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011, introduced by Representative UPTON of Michigan. On rollcall vote No. 233, H. Amdt. 240 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 234, H. Amdt. 241 offered by Representative JACKSON LEE of Texas, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 235, H. Amdt. 244 offered by Representative MURPHY of Connecticut, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 236, H. Amdt. 245 offered by Representative WAXMAN of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 237, H. Amdt. 247 offered by Representative POLIS of Colorado, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 238, H. Amdt. 248 offered by Representative MARKEY of Massachusetts, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 239, H. Amdt. 249 offered by Representative RUSH of Illinois, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 240, H. Amdt. 250 offered by Representative DOYLE of Pennsylvania, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 241, H. Amdt. 251 offered by Representative KIND of Wisconsin, I would have voted "no."

On Thursday, April 7, the House considered H. Res. 206, offered by Representative FOXX of Virginia, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1363) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. On rollcall vote No. 242, on Ordering the Previous Question, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 243, on Agreeing to the Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 244, on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "yes."

Also on April 7, the House considered H.R. 1363, the Department of Defense and Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011, introduced by Representative ROGERS of Kentucky. On rollcall vote No. 245, Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 246, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative OWENS of New York, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 247, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

Then the House completed consideration of H.R. 910. On rollcall vote No. 248, on Motion to Recommit with Instructions offered by Representative MCNERNY of California, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 249, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Friday, April 8, the House considered H.J. Res. 37, Disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to regulating the Internet and broadband industry practices, introduced by Representative WALDEN of Oregon. On rollcall vote No. 250, On Consideration of the Joint Resolution, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 251, Table Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 252, on Passage, I would have voted "yes."

On Saturday, April 9, the House considered H.R. 1363, Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2011, and for other purposes, introduced by Representative ROGERS of Kentucky. On rollcall vote No. 253, on Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment, I would have voted "yes."

REMEMBERING THE TRAGIC GULF OIL SPILL AND WORKING TO PREVENT FUTURE SPILLS

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a tragic event. One year ago, next Wednesday, an oil rig explosion in the Gulf of Mexico resulted in eleven families losing their loved ones. The explosion started what soon became the largest oil spill in United States history. It took far too long to stop this spill and the environmental and economic impacts will be felt for years to come. Twelve months later, Congress has not enacted any legislation to address the policy and management issues that contributed to the severity of last year's spill. This is unacceptable. We owe it to those who perished in the explosion, as well as those whose lives and businesses were impacted in the months that followed, to address the deficiencies in current federal policy.

That is why I am reintroducing the SAFEGUARDS Act, legislation I drafted last year to prevent and respond to future oil spills. I was not surprised that a report by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling (Oil Spill Commission) highlighted the need for the changes I recommend, as the measure was developed following a series of meetings and regular phone calls with the on-the-ground incident commanders, local research teams and community emergency response personnel. It is my hope that the solutions put forth in this measure will be included in a wider legislative response to ensure that we impose rigorous safety standards on any off-shore platforms, while also establishing a fully thought out plan to respond to future disasters.

As I said last Congress, an uncontrolled discharge of oil is truly a worst-case scenario that oil companies and the federal government should be required to have an established plan for. While the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) has established specific safeguards to take into account the effects that drilling has on our environment, BP was permitted categorical exclusions from these requirements. No oil company should be exempt from addressing the environmental impact that their drilling activities impose. The SAFEGUARDS Act will ensure that NEPA requirements are not ignored again by, first, prohibiting categorical exclusions from NEPA, and second, extending the time period regulatory agencies have to review oil explorations proposals. Regulatory agencies currently have only a 30-day period to review extensive and intricate drilling proposals, however this bill will give regulatory agencies up to 150 days to ensure exploration plans are properly reviewed.

Not only was BP granted exemptions from environmental standards, they were also allowed to move forward without a prepared response plan for the failure of the blowout preventer. As recommended by the Oil Spill Commission "oil spill response plans should be required to include detailed plans for source control [which] demonstrate that an operator's containment technology is immediately deployable and effective." The SAFEGUARDS Act would require all oil spill response plans to

account for a true worst possible scenario, including the uncontrolled discharge of oil resulting from the failure of a blowout preventer or other containment devices.

The oil disaster in the Gulf has also brought much attention to the leadership and organization of the response and containment efforts currently in place. While the Coast Guard is ultimately responsible for leading the government's response to an oil spill in America's coastal waters, they are not required to approve oil spill response plans submitted by oil rigs. Instead, each rig was only required to submit their spill response plans to the now disbanded Minerals Management Service, an agency with many well-documented problems administering rig safety standards. The Oil Spill Commission notes that "oil spill response plans, including source-control measures, should be subject to interagency review and approval by the Coast Guard." The SAFEGUARDS Act will make this a requirement for all current and future oil rigs, as well as establish the Commandant of the Coast Guard as the National Incident Commander to oversee the federal government's response to large oil spills in coastal waters.

Finally, the SAFEGUARDS Act will address some of the inadequacies in federal response efforts highlighted by last year's spill. The framework of the National Contingency Plan, which is the federal government response plan for all oil spills, has not been updated since 1994. The SAFEGUARDS Act will require the response plan to be updated at least every five years and to have unique plans for responding to oil spills in our coastal waters. Further, this bill will require the EPA to begin monitoring water quality within forty-eight hours after an oil spill is discovered. It is important for the public to have accurate information about how our water, our wildlife and our beaches are being affected as quickly as possible.

After finally stopping the flow of oil we now need to address the systematic breakdowns that led to the BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe. The SAFEGUARDS Act presents commonsense solutions to help prevent a disaster of this magnitude from ever happening again, and improves the federal response in the event it ever does. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this measure. The Congress must get to work on oil spill response legislation; we owe it to the American people and the entire Gulf Coast.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN RAY MARTINI

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ray Martini, a World War II veteran and distinguished resident of Half Moon Bay, California.

Mr. Martini entered the European theater of war at age 23. In his five months of deployment, this young plumber accomplished extraordinary achievements. He arrived as a lieutenant in the Air Force and left as a Captain. He won an Air Medal, the Distinguished Flying Cross and eleven Oak Leaf Clusters.

He flew over 50 bombing and strafing missions as a one-man crew of a Thunderbolt